

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
NASHVILLE DIVISION

MEMPHIS A. PHILLIP RANDOLPH
INSTUTUTE, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

TRE HARGETT, et al.,

Defendants.

NO. 3-20-cv-00374
JUDGE RICHARDSON

ORDER


Yesterday, the Supreme Court of Tennessee issued a decision (“*Fisher* opinion”) in the consolidated appeals of the cases of *Fisher v. Hargett* (No. 2020-00831-SC-RDM-CV) and *Lay v. Goins* (No. M2020-00832-SC-RDM-CV). The Court perceives that the decision likely will affect the scope of (preliminary) relief requested by Plaintiffs pursuant to their pending Motion for Preliminary Injunction (Doc. No. 40, “Motion”). The Court likewise perceives that the decision likely will affect the rationales in support of, or in opposition to, the granting of some (but by no means necessarily all) of the relief requested in the Motion.

Accordingly, by August 11, 2020, Plaintiffs shall advise the Court: (a) of any changes to the scope of the relief they are requesting via the Motion; (b) in at least general terms of any changes to their asserted rationale for the granting of the relief requested in the Motion; and (c) whether they request more time (and if so, how much time) to advise the Court in more detail as to any changed asserted rationale for the granting of the relief requested in the Motion. By August 14, 2020, Defendants shall provide at least a preliminary response to (a) any changes to the scope of the relief Plaintiffs are requesting via the Motion; (b) any changes in Plaintiffs’ rationale for the

granting of relief requested in the Motion; and (c) whether they request more time (and if so, how much time) to respond in more detail.

The parties are advised that they need not reiterate or fully summarize the contents of the *Fisher* opinion, with which the Court is already fully familiar. However, the parties may, as they deem appropriate in advising the Court as directed above, summarize or highlight particular pertinent aspects of the *Fisher* opinion, and/or draw warranted inferences and conclusions from the *Fisher* opinion, and/or assert that particular relevant effects are likely to ensue from the *Fisher* opinion.

IT IS SO ORDERED.


ELI RICHARDSON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE